

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action dated March 27, 2006. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to more clearly point out the present inventive concept. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 are pending in this Application.

REGARDING THE SPECIFICATION

Applicant appreciates the Examiner providing the guidelines for the preferred layout for the specification of a utility Application. Applicant has amended the specification by placing headings between the appropriate paragraphs in the specification.

REGARDING THE CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 1 was objected to because of a spelling error. Applicant has amended Claim 1 eliminating the spelling error. Applicant respectfully requests that the claim objection be withdrawn.

REGARDING THE § 103 REJECTIONS

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being rendered obvious by *Lauer et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,523,769) and *Tamanoi* (U.S. Patent No. 5,565,885), and further in view of *Kasai et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,120).

Lauer is directed to a high resolution modular large screen display which is divided into a plurality of active modules. The *Lauer* megapixel displays are shown in one *Lauer* embodiment in Figure 1A as module 12. The modules 12 are arranged in a five module wide by two module high display unit which is approximately six feet by two feet in dimension. See column 6, lines 32-36. Each *Lauer* module is a separate device. See Figure 4, element 50 and Figure 1A, element 12. Each *Lauer* module 50 comprises one group of pixels thereon; Rather than multiple groups of pixels thereon. The modules 50 are provided “in an array, with a central module 50’ being provided with structured data over a high bandwidth channel 51 from a structured data generator 52. Each of the active modules 50 has its own processor so that only structured data may be sent to this active module.” Applicant respectfully points out that the single group of pixels found on a *Lauer* module 50 has only one processor for the entire group of pixels. Applicant submits that *Lauer* does not teach a substrate that has “groups of pixels wherein each group of pixels is within a separate defined area on said substrate.” Furthermore, *Lauer* does not teach that there are a plurality of semiconductor devices, “wherein each semiconductor device is mainly associated with a different group of pixels, and wherein each semiconductor device is positioned within the defined area of the group of pixels that it is mainly associated with.”

Although *Tamanoi* teaches a display device comprising a substrate, Applicant respectfully submits that *Tamanoi* does not teach, allude to or render obvious “a plurality of semiconductor devices, wherein each semiconductor device is mainly associated with a different group of pixels, and wherein each semiconductor device is positioned within the defined area of the group of pixels that it is mainly associated with.” Instead, *Tamanoi* teaches a plurality of semiconductor integrated circuit chips 18 that are formed “around the panel 16 such that they surround the panel. *Tamanoi* column 3, lines 20-31.

Kasai does not remedy the deficiencies of *Lauer* and *Tamanoi*.

Regarding Claim 1, this claim recites, among other things, “a plurality of semiconductor devices wherein each semiconductor device is mainly associated with a different group of pixels, and wherein each semiconductor device is positioned within a defined area of the group of pixels that it is mainly associated with. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the cited art and respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 3 are each dependent upon Claim 1 and are therefore not rendered obvious for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 1. As such, Applicant respectfully requests for the § 103 rejection for claims 2 and 3 to be withdrawn.

Claims 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious by *Lauer*, *Tamanoi*, *Kasai*, and further in view of *Nomura et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,866,520).

Claims 4-7 are each indirectly dependent upon Claim 1 and are therefore rendered obvious for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that *Nomura* does not complete the deficiencies of *Lauer*, *Tamanoi* and *Kasai* and therefore does not render Claims 4-7 obvious. Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious by *Lauer*, *Tamanoi*, *Kasai*, *Namura* and further in view of *Anwyl et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,576,738).

Although *Anwyl*'s activity detector 403 might be considered a means to detect changes between the contents of subsequent frames, Applicant respectfully submits that *Anwyl* does not complete the deficiencies of the other cited art. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 8 is not rendered obvious by the cited art and respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious by *Lauer* and *Tamanoi* in view of *Takeda* (U.S. Patent No. 4,903,013).

Applicant respectfully submits that although *Takeda* might teach a display system that has a plurality of display areas having RAM, Applicant further submits that *Takeda* does not complete the deficiencies of *Lauer* and *Tamanoi* and therefore does not aid in rendering Claim 9 obvious. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn and submits that Claim 9 is ready for allowance.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being rendered obvious by *Lauer* and *Tamanoi* in view of *Nakano et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,181).

Although Applicant submits that *Nakano* might teach a bus structure used in a drive means, Applicant respectfully submits that *Nakano* combined with the other cited art does not teach, allude to or render obvious Claim 10 because *Nakano* does not complete the deficiencies of the other cited art. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn and submits that Claim 10 is ready for allowance.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/PELT-27,798 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

/srg/
Steven R. Greenfield
Registration No. 38,166

SRG/keb/dd

P.O. Box 741715
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715
Tel: 972-479-0462
Fax: 972-479-0464
July 21, 2006